



# World-Service

The Jew uses the lie as his most effective weapon to attain his goal and to conquer the world. Truth is his worst enemy.

"World-Service" has taken upon itself the task of enlightening all non-Jewish peoples and of revealing to them Jewry's sinister intentions and its criminal methods. Recognition of this danger is the first step towards its elimination. "World-Service" has dedicated itself to truthfully reporting important news-items pertaining to Jews and Jewry and thereby safeguarding the liberties of all nations.

Whoever is cognisant of this Jewish danger is requested to communicate with "World-Service", Frankfurt/M., P.O.B. 600. Only through co-operation it is possible to avert the threatening danger.

**Payments:**

Germany:  
Dresdner Bank, Depositenkasse H.  
Frankfurt a. M.

Postal cheque-account:  
Frankfurt a. M. No. 6201.

Hungary:  
László Levatic, Postal saving's  
bank-account Nr. 40703,  
Budapest.

Publisher: Dipl.-Ing. A. Schirmer.  
Editor: Erich Schwarzburg.  
Address: "World-Service", Frankfurt a. M.,  
Box 600.

New subscription prices:  
6 months — 1.25 Dollars (U.S.A.)  
5.— sh. (Engl.)  
12 months — 2.50 Dollars (U.S.A.)  
10.— sh. (Engl.)

The reproduction of this bulletin is permitted and desired, provided that the source of information is indicated (World-Service) and the Publishers receive 5 copies of any newspaper containing items reproduced.

— Bulletin published twice monthly in 11 languages. —

*Special number.*

12. 6. 1940

**A bimonthly bulletin  
issued in 11 languages:**

German edition:

**Welt-Dienst**

English edition:

**World-Service**

French edition:

**Service Mondial**

Russian edition:

**Мировая Служба**

Hungarian edition:

**Világ-Szolgálat**

Spanish edition:

**Servicio Mundial**

Dutch edition:

**Wereld-Dienst**

Rumanian edition:

**Serviciul Mondial**

Danish edition:

**Verdens-Service**

Norwegian edition:

**Verdens-Tjenesten**

Swedish edition:

## CONTENTS.

# *How Jewry turned England into a Plutocratic State.*

**An Historical Survey.**

Hume, the classic among England's historians in his fundamental work, "The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688", Vol. II, Ch. X., p. 139, (London 1803) writes:

"The greater part of that kind of dealing (usury) fell every where into the hands of the Jews; who, being already infamous on account of their religion, had no honour to lose, and were apt to exercise a profession, odious in itself, by every kind of rigour, and even sometimes by rapine and extortion."

PUBLISHERS NOTE

This publication was first published in 1940. Unfortunately, the paper it was printed on was a cheap commercial brand which has over the past 45 years yellowed.

Due to the high cost of re-typsetting this important document, if it were re-typeset it would be impossible to print and resell it for less than \$6.00 per copy.

Since we receive numerous requests for information about Cromwell and the Jews we felt that our readers would overlook the imperfections of the quality of the document itself, and find the information contained within, well worth it's reference value to the true researcher.

Page --7-- (page #8 of this PDF) was omitted from the scan and has been reconstructed by copying the text from <http://subversivewar.blogspot.com/2007/12/historical-survey.html> and <http://web.archive.org/web/20070208195009/> <http://gnrevival.com/Jewish+World+Service.htm>

--absent the page image that text has not been verified.

## How Jewry turned England into a Plutocratic State. An Historical Survey.

### I.

In "World-Service" we have often proved that Jewish and British Imperialism both have the same aims. For these reasons absolute solidarity exists between World-Jewry and the ruling classes of Great Britain. World-Jewry, and especially the representatives of big Jewish Capital in Great Britain, her Dominions and Colonies, consider the British Empire only as a stepping stone towards a coming Jewish World-Empire.

For this reason it is no wonder that recognised Jewish and liberalist historians and national economists, in writing the history of British Imperialism and Capitalism, confine themselves almost entirely to recording the history of the rise of the Jew in England and of how British finance came to be Jew-controlled<sup>1)2)3)</sup>.

In the course of the last three hundred years Jewry has understood how to expand its financial position and its power-politics in England to the fullest extent and to anchor it down so firmly that England has become a plutocratic instead of a national state.

By plutocracy one understands a form of government, in which the election of its members rests upon their possessing wealth. The word plutocracy is derived from the Greek roots *plutos* = riches and *kratein* = to rule. Plutocracy therefore means: the rule of money-power, or more freely expressed: the government of Jewish gold.

The historical example of a state ruled by riches and possessions is Carthage, in which the Jewish element was also represented. It was governed by the rich merchants, who were represented by a kind of "lower house" named "the Council of the Three Hundred" and a "upper house" named "the Council of the Thirty". The people were barred from exercising any influence on the government.

For Jewry plutocracy is the most suitable form of government. Through plutocracy the immense Jewish capitalism, without respect to the number of Jews represented, of necessity procures a governing, political position, for in a plutocratic state, as history teaches us, a small Jewish clique can dictate to a great state, if it is in possession of the necessary amount of capital.

The statesmen of the English plutocracy are therefore no more than the deputies and the trustees of the ruling class consisting of Jews and a strongly judaised aristocracy, who are in possession of the enormous wealth of the British Empire. They are furthermore, nothing else but the general directors of an immense high-finance concern, with only one object in view, that of increasing the wealth of this concern within the shortest time-limit and to as great an extent as possible. Therefore the English statesmen are either themselves big capitalists, greatly interested in numerous industrial undertakings, or they are bought by Jewish-English finance-capitalism and must, for this reason, blindly obey the dictates of the Jewish-English plutocratic clique.

The English government is only the British facade for the Jew in the background. The English statesmen are the well-paid dummies of Jewish-English finance-capitalism. The British Empire is the biggest capitalistic concern which exists. It is an enormous corporation, whose principal shareholders are Jews. The aim of this company is the exploitation of the people who live within the British Empire and in the states under British hegemony, and the ever-increasing accumulation of untold wealth, which only benefits, and is enjoyed by, the ruling Jewish-English plutocratic clique. In England we therefore find on the one hand excessive riches and on the other hand dire poverty and destitution of millions of the English people. The Jewish-English capitalism, the Jewish-English plutocracy is not satisfied with merely exploiting the inhabitants of the colonies in the most shameless way; in its unsatiable greed it in no way shows a sense of responsibility towards its own nation. Because the English Government is only the deputy of Jewish-English finance-capital, therefore Jewish interests and the interests of the English ruling classes to-day in England are identical; but neither of them in any way is identical with the interests of the English nation. On the contrary; their interests are directly against those of the English nation. Great Britain, the richest country in the world, presents a picture of the greatest and most dreadful poverty in the midst of enormous wealth. A state, whose government tests every matter from the standpoint: "Is it advantageous for finance, or not?" has therefore brought a sixth of its population so low that they live in hovels unfit for human habitation. After thorough investigation the prominent medical specialists, John MacConigle and Saint John Orr, have recorded that in England 15 million people, that means a quarter of the total population, suffer from malnutrition. Before the outbreak of the present war England had 2 million unemployed. At present there are still one million unemployed. Tens of thousands of people yearly migrate from the country to the towns, there to eke out a meagre proletarian life or to go under. Yearly thousands of acres of farm-land are withdrawn from cultivation. Yearly increasing numbers of cottonmills close down and throw their workers on the streets.

All this happens because it is in the interest of finance, for the enormous profits of the Jewish-English plutocratic clique are only to a limited degree the result of the productive powers of the English worker. The profits result principally from the sweat of the poorly paid natives of the Far East, they result from the continual stream of imported Argentine meat and foreign foodstuffs, while every English farmer must battle to save his farm from bankruptcy. While British workers from the shoe- and leather factories are walking the streets of Northampton and Leicester in search of employment, millions of pairs of shoes are being imported from overseas. While in Yorkshire and Lancashire the factories are being closed down, millions of yards of cotton goods and material are being imported from the Far East and the enormous shortage of material for export is made up by the erection of similar industries in the colonies and by the rigorous exploitation of natives in the Far East, to the detriment of the mother-industry and thereby to the detriment of the English nation, which becomes more and more impoverished and is more and more thrown into unemployment.

While the farmer is faced with absolute ruin, millions of tons of foreign meat, vegetables, and fruit are

<sup>1)</sup> Hertz: "The British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century".

<sup>2)</sup> John Francis: "History of the Bank of England".

<sup>3)</sup> Werner Sombart: "Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben". Leipzig 1911.

thrown on the English market and all this only because the Jewish-English plutocratic clique receives bigger profits. In this way international "robber"-economics is carried on at the expense of the English nation. This is the curse of plutocracy.

In this Jewish-English plutocratic swamp all manner of corruption naturally flourishes.

One asks oneself: How was it possible for England ever to come to such a pass? How was it possible for Jewish finance-capital to conquer England? How and when did the Jews indeed first come to live in England? How did they manage to get so much power into their hands? How and when did Jewish blood penetrate into the ruling classes of England? How did they manage to corrupt the blood of the English aristocracy? What did the English nation say to the Jewish penetration? Did the people take these things calmly or did they, through their natural national instinct, protest against this increasing judaising?

We will try to follow the penetration of the Jew into England, and to show the means the Jews used to conquer England and to turn it into a plutocratic state. Above all we wish to describe the rise of the Jews to power in England in the 18th Century because in this period they laid the foundation of their present powerful position. We have based our historical survey only on the work of recognised historians and on Jewish material from Jewish sources. Our survey therefore bears a strong historical character. The sources from which we have our wealth of information are at all times open for inspection.

## II.

Jewry's rise to power in England took place in three sharply defined stages, which are separated by intervals of about 100 years.

Under Cromwell's rule and during the first half of the Restoration period, under Charles II., the Jews, after having been banned from England for a period of more than 550 years, again swarmed into England.

Cromwell's rule is characterised by an outspoken British imperial policy. With regard to his financial as well as his political policy Cromwell depended upon the Jews to be the backbone of his colonial expansion. Jewish agents carried on economic- and political espionage for Cromwell, availing themselves of the Jewish business houses in foreign countries. In Cromwell's time, exactly as 100 and 200 years later, a small ruling Jewish clique was formed, at whose head one Jew appeared as the backbone of the new colonial economic policy. In Cromwell's time it was the enormously rich sephardic Jew Antony Fernandez Carvajal who occupied this position<sup>4)</sup>).

4) John Thurloe: "State Papers":  
Vol. I pp. 386/387.  
Vol. II pp. 27/28, 399/400, 651/652.  
Vol. IV pp. 61/62/63, 308, 321/322, 333, 343, 771/772.  
Vol. V pp. 572, 588, 643/646, 663, 709/710, 722/723.

State Papers, Domestic Interregnum.  
Parliamentary Diary of Burton.

5) Guizot: "Histoire de la République d'Angleterre".  
Raguenet: "Histoire d'Oliver Cromwell".  
Francis: "History of the Bank of England".  
Lucien Wolf:

a) "Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell".  
b) "The Jewish Intelligencers" pp. 88—108  
from "The Jewish Literary Annual" 1904.  
c) "The Crypto-Jews Under The Commonwealth",  
pp. 55—88.  
from "The Jewish Historical Society of England",  
Vol. I, 1893—94.

A hundred years later the second stage of the Jew's rise to power in England commences. The Jewish clique in England was then led by the exceedingly rich sephardic Jew, Sampson Gideon, who also greatly influenced the English cabinet ministers. At that time the influence of the Jews on finance-capital in England was already so great, that without exaggeration one may say, that English Jews were controlling the English money market<sup>6)</sup>.

Together with Sampson Gideon the following Jews took a leading part in English finance-administration: the Jews Alvaro Lopez Suasso, Francis and Joseph Salvador, known as Jessurun Alvarez in the Jewish community, and Anthony da Costa.

Francis Salvador was the director of the Dutch East India Company.

The banking-house of Francis and Joseph Salvador was for some time the leading banking house of England.

As early as the middle of the 18th Century, for the first time, a Jew, Anthony da Costa, was elected director of the Bank of England<sup>7)</sup>.

Under the leadership of Sampson Gideon the Jews sought to break down the barrier erected by the time-approved laws against the influx of foreign Jews. The English nation, aroused to anger, strenuously opposed this Jewish effort. The Jews therefore could accomplish nothing by constitutional means, but already their power was so great, and by working from behind the scenes the influential English Jews saw to it, that these time-approved laws were evaded and set at naught.

Again, a hundred years later, in the 19th Century, we encounter the last and most decisive period, during which the Jews attempt their emancipation. Jewish personalities such as Rothschild, Montefiore, Bernal, Montagu, Ricardo and Disraeli at the beginning of the Victorian age, fought for and gained equal rights for Jewry within the English law.

To prove the assimilation between Jews and Britons which has taken place during the last hundred years, and which establishes the fact that the English plutocracy is thoroughly intermixed with Jews, it is necessary to give an account of the fight for their emancipation in which the Jews, in conjunction with a corrupt clique of aristocrats, in the middle of the 18th Century engaged, against the English Parliament and the English nation.

In the middle of the 18th Century the English Jews, taking advantage of their then already extensive connections and intermarriage with the English aristocracy and the ruling classes of England, thought to obtain permission for their co-religionists to enter England and tried to make it easy for them to obtain citizenship. As early as the year 1740, during the reign of George II., the old English laws regarding citizenship were violated. Both English Houses of Parliament passed a law, that Jews, who had lived in one of the English colonies in America for seven years, could obtain naturalisation, without taking Holy Communion or without carrying out other religious ceremonies. Under the protection of these Naturalisation Laws of 1740, round about 200 Jews entered into England in the period between 1740—1755. They came from the English colonies in America and obtained citizenship in England, having

d) "American Elements In The Re-Settlement", pp. 76—99 from "The Jewish Historical Society of England", Vol. III, 1896—98.

Bishop Burnet: "History of his own time".

e) Francis: "History of the Bank of England", Vol. I, p. 169.

7) Uyamson: "The Jews in England", pp. 264/65.

made use of this furtive roundabout way of obtaining naturalisation, namely, having lived in an English colony in America for seven years<sup>8)</sup>.

At the end of the 16th Century, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, about a hundred Jews lived in England<sup>9)</sup>. In Cromwell's time about 50—40 Jewish families were living in England<sup>10)</sup>. The majority of these were Crypto-Jews or New-Christians<sup>11)</sup>, that is, Jews baptised into the Roman Catholic faith. Twelve unbaptised Jews, those Jews who practiced their religious rites, are said to have lived in London round about the year 1665, that is, shortly after the English Revolution<sup>12)</sup>. In 1737 there were about 6.000 Jews living in England, in 1755 about 8.000<sup>13)</sup>, and in 1787 about 12.000<sup>14)</sup>. The rich English Jews of this time had influential friends among the English Statesmen and nobility. The best known politician and statesman of the first half of the 18th Century, Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Oxford, was on friendly terms with the clique of London Jews. Even his private life was not free of Jewish influence. Robert Walpole had a Jewish mistress, the illfamed actress Hannah Norsa, the daughter of a sephardic Jew, Norsa<sup>15)</sup>. The famous English historian, Smollet, made the following statement regarding Walpole and his corrupt administration, in which English politicians were conclusively implicated:

"Notwithstanding this great obstruction, purposely thrown in the way of the inquiry, the secret committee discovered many flagrant instances of fraud and corruption in which the Earl of Oxford had been concerned. It appeared that he had granted fraudulent contracts for paying the troops in the West Indies: that he had employed iniquitous arts to influence elections: that for secret service, during the last ten years, he had touched one million four hundred fifty-three thousand four hundred pounds of the public money: that above fifty thousand pounds of this sum had been paid to authors and printers of newspapers and political tracts written in defence of the ministry: that on the very day which preceded his resignation he had signed orders on the civil list revenues for above thirty thousand pounds: but as the cash remaining in the Exchequer did not much exceed fourteen thousand pounds, he had raised the remaining part of the thirty thousand, by pawning the orders to a banker"<sup>16)</sup>.

No wonder that it was easy for the richest leading Jew of that time, Sampson de Rehuel Abudiente, called Sampson Gideon, to serve Jewish interests by making use of a man like Robert Walpole, who seemed to be born for corruption. The Jewish historian, James Picciotto writes concerning the dependence of both Robert Walpole, as a private individual, and

the English Parliament upon Sampson Gideon, as follows:

"One of the most important Jews in London in the middle of the 18th Century was Sampson Gideon. He was the friend of the English Prime Minister Walpole and supplied the State finances. His financial operations were carried out on what was at that time considered a gigantic scale. During the crisis that followed the bursting of the "South Sea Bubble", the general public more than once looked askance at Gideon. He, however, stood firm as a rock and as impenetrable as a sphinx. It was said that at this time he rendered Sir Robert Walpole considerable service, not only with respect to his private concerns, but also by materially supporting the Prime minister and helping him to restore the public to calmness and confidence"<sup>17)</sup>

When in the year 1745, under the leadership of the "Pretender", Bonny Prince Charlie, the Stuarts rebelled and the "Pretender's" troops were nearing London, a panic was created and large stocks of merchandise were sold, of which Sampson Gideon bought the biggest share<sup>18)</sup>. The English government bonds were thrown upon the market and a considerable amount of them were bought up by Gideon. The well-known, Jew-friendly historian John Francis, writes concerning this<sup>19)</sup>:

"It is not unnoteworthy of notice that a Hebrew has generally presided over the money market. At the period of the rebellion in 1715, there was a Sir Manassch Lopez. During the South Sea Bubble, however, Mr. Guy dealt largely in seamen's tickets and other securities. He founded Guy's Hospital, considering, perhaps, that "charity covereth a multitude of sins". The goldsmiths, with the Rothschilds and Ricardos, have since occupied the same important position. About 1745 it was Sir Sampson Gideon. The following is a remarkable feature in the life of the founder of the house of Eardley.

In the great rebellion just described, the funds vacillated in proportion to the Pretender's success. At one period they were very low; and Mr. Gideon bought every species of public security which he could possibly procure. In vain his friends looked grave, remonstrated, and kindly predicted his ruin. The sagacious Hebrew replied, "If the Pretender should come to London, he will settle my account. If not, I shall be a very rich man."

"The event is known. Gideon amassed a large fortune; was made a baronet; and his family eventually became ennobled"<sup>20)</sup>.

From the writings of John Francis we take cognisance of the fact, that the Jews, since the beginning of the 18th Century, have ruled the English money market, and that the Jew Sampson Gideon in the middle of the 18th Century played a similar role to that played by the goldsmiths, the Rothschilds and Ricardos about a hundred years later. The government crisis of 1745 was a lucrative business for the Jewish clique. Gideon was in a position to double his resources during 1745<sup>21)</sup>.

\*

8) a) "Jewish Quarterly Review", 1907, XIX, 318.

b) "Oxford Memoirs": (ed. 1852), I, 317.

9) Cecil Roth: "A History of the Marranos", p. 296.

10) Dr. Chamberlain: "Anglia Notizia".

11) Lucien Wolf: "The Crypto Jews Under The Commonwealth" from "The Jewish Historical Society of England" Vol. I, 1895—94.

12) a) "Ellis Original Letters, illustrative of English History", pp. 7—21, London Harding and Lepard 1827.

b) Tovey: "Anglia Judaica", p. 279.

13) Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", London Archibald Constable and Co., pp. 62/63.

14) Graf Mirabeau: "Sur Moses Mendelssohn, sur la Réforme politique des Juifs", 1787, p. 129.

15) a) Lecky: "Geschichte Englands im 18. Jahrhundert", I, 581.

b) "B'nai B'rith National Jewish Monthly", Juni 1934.

c) "World-Service" VII/5/6 of 1st—15th March 1940, Article 14

16) Smollet: "The history of England", vol. IV, J. J. Tourneisen, Basil, 1745, p. 174.

17) a) "The Jewish Encyclopaedia", Vol. V, p. 662.

b) Picciotto: "Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History", p. 60.

18) "The Jewish Encyclopaedia", Vol. V, pp. 662/663.

19) John Francis: "History of the Bank of England, Its Times and Traditions", p. 169.

20) John Francis: "History of the Bank of England, Its Times and Traditions", Vol. I, p. 169.

21) a) "The Jewish Encyclopaedia", 1905, Vol. V, p. 662.

b) John Francis: "Chronicles of the Stock Exchange".

c) "Jewish World", February 1878.

A page from the original text of a book by John Francis, (Willoughby & Co., London, 1848): "The History of the Bank of England, Its Times and Traditions", in which the control of the English money market by the Jews is described.

BANK OF ENGLAND.

169

kept; and well are they preserved, as pregnant vouchers no less of the Bank's pristine simplicity and confined exertions, than of the amazing rapidity of its modern extension, and almost boundless accommodation of the monied interest and commercial world."

It is not unworthy of notice that a Hebrew has generally presided over the money market. At the period of the rebellion in 1715, there was a Sir Manasseh Lopez. During the South Sea bubble, however, Mr. Guy dealt largely in seamen's tickets and other securities. He founded Guy's Hospital, considering, perhaps, that "charity covereth a multitude of sins." The goldsmiths, with the Rothschilds and Ricardos, have since occupied the same important position. About 1745 it was Sir Sampson Gideon. The following is a remarkable feature in the life of the founder of the house of Eardley.

In the great rebellion just described, the funds vacillated in proportion to the pretender's success. At one period they were very low; and Mr. Gideon bought every species of public security which he could possibly procure. In vain his friends looked grave, remonstrated, and kindly predicted his ruin. The sagacious Hebrew replied, "If the Pretender should come to London, he will settle my account. If not, I shall be a very rich man."\*

The event is known. Gideon amassed a large fortune; was made a baronet; and his family eventually became ennobled.

\* Communicated to the Author by Mr. J. J. Wilkinson, author of the valuable work entitled "Law of the Public Funds."

To obtain power in England the Jews carried out the following tactics:

After being banished from England for a period of more than 550 years they managed to gain a firm footing in Cromwell's time. Within a short time a very small Jewish clique managed to amass great fortunes. By means of their wealth the Jews secured connection with the English ruling classes and the nobility. Even at that time the Jews wormed their way into the aristocracy by marriage. And now they sought to increase Jewry's power in England by inducing swarms of Jews into the country. The English nation had however through existing immigration- and naturalisation-laws built up a strong bulwark against these Jewish endeavours. Therefore a small but powerful Jewish clique made this first attack upon these naturalisation laws. Even in 1740 they managed to violate these existing laws and to secure the immigration of further Jews into England. In 1755 there were round about 8,000 Jews in England. In 1787 the number was 12,000. To increase Jewry's influence in England, the Jews made certain that they had a friend in the person of the then most important statesman, Sir Robert Walpole. Through his Jewish mistress, Hannah Norsa, through outright bribery and all manner of shady financial deals and corruption, Jewry chained this disloyal English statesman ever closer to itself, and made him the willing tool of Jewish finance and power politics. It is quite clear that in England Jew-control and corruption of the government is an old tradition.

But there is something else that is of interest regarding those times. We find the Jews as absolute masters of the money market. We see further, that they acquire their enormous wealth by dishonest means, be it by shady financial deals and transactions, made possible only by the bribery of cabinet ministers or by unsavoury speculations. During the rebellion, led by Bonny Prince Charlie in 1745, the Jew Sampson Gideon seized the opportunity of making an immense fortune which he played on both sides. He took advantage of the first stages of panic created by the rebellion to buy up enormous quantities of stocks of merchandise and government bonds for a mere song, venturing his all on the government being victorious. On the other hand he kept in the good graces of the rebel Prince, hoping, that in case of an eventual victory, the Prince out of gratitude would redeem at a good price, the English State Papers, which he, the Jew, had acquired at such a cheap rate. The Jew, Sampson Gideon, had therefore at the expense of the English nation, landed a successful coup.

But there is something else of importance. We see that even then the ruling aristocratic clique was in every respect corrupt, for only under those circumstances was it possible that such an unscrupulous speculator as Sampson Gideon, who had robbed the English nation of millions of money, could have become the founder of a "noble" family. Here we see the first sign of the assimilation of the Jews with the English nobility, an assimilation which was very soon to lead to an intermixing of the blood and eventually to the disintegration the nobility altogether.

How strongly this infiltration of Jewish blood affected the English noble families is described by the English author, Hilaire Belloc<sup>22)</sup> in the following words:

<sup>22)</sup> Hilaire Belloc: "The Jews", p. 225.

Other Sources: "World-Service", VII/56 of 1st-15th March 1940, Article 14.

"Marriages began to take place, wholesale, between what had once been the aristocratic territorial families of this country and the Jewish commercial fortunes.

After two generations of this, with the opening of the twentieth century those of the great territorial English families in which there was no Jewish blood were the exception. In nearly all of them was the strain more or less marked, in some of them so strong that though the name was still an English name and the traditions those of a purely English lineage of the long past, the physique and character had become wholly Jewish and the members of the family were taken for Jews whenever they travelled in countries where the gentry had not yet suffered or enjoyed this admixture."

### III.

Even during the Franco-Spanish hostilities from 1742 — to 1744 Sampson Gideon was financial adviser to the English government and loaned it money. Through his intervention the Jewish clique in London in 1745, loaned the government £ 1,700,000<sup>23)</sup>. During the financial crisis in 1749, the same Jewish clique again loaned the government money. In 1755 Sampson Gideon personally owned English government bonds to the value of £ 200,000 pounds<sup>24)</sup>. The Jew Mendez da Costa also was personally interested to equally as big an amount as Gideon<sup>25)</sup>.

No wonder, that the English Jews wished to abuse the power afforded them by their great wealth to place themselves on an equal footing with the English aristocracy and the English citizens. For this purpose they made use of the old and proven method of bribery, which had been used by the Jews a century earlier in Cromwell's time, and which they used again after the Whitehall Conference had brought their efforts to nought. From a report dated December 3, 1655 sent to his government by Salvetti, Ambassador of Toskana in London, we read that the Jews did their best to bribe their opponents into their way of thinking, and by means of their gold attempted to accomplish their aims<sup>26)</sup>. The bribery of important politicians and the intermarriage with the old-established English families were the methods by which the Jews sought to attain their goal. The immorality at Court in the reign of George I. and George II. opened the doors wide for the Jews. Once having gained a footing in Society, the ambition of the English Jews, and their bid for power was directed to acquiring estates and to being ennobled. Concerning such efforts "The Jewish Chronicle"<sup>27)</sup> published an article written by the well-known English-Jewish historian, Hyamson. There we read:

"A desire had already arisen among the richer foreign Jews settled in England to obtain for themselves the same status as that enjoyed by their co-religionists who had been born in the country. There was also, despite the many decisions given in favour of the contention of the Jews, considerable doubt whether even English-born Jews were qualified to own estates, and foremost among those who desired this point definitely and finally decided in favour of the Jewish claims was the famous financier, Sampson Gideon, a personal friend of Walpole, and the trusted financial adviser of the Government. Gideon had already acquired the

<sup>23)</sup> "The Jewish Encyclopaedia", Vol. V, p. 662.

<sup>24)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century" p. 72.

<sup>25)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century" p. 73.

<sup>26)</sup> Roth: "New Light" p. 150.

<sup>27)</sup> "The Jewish Chronicle" of April 6, 1906: "The Jew Bill of 1753".

ambition to establish a family among the landed gentry of the kingdom, and the promised legislation, he thought, would contribute valuable assistance to his project.”

The English Jews in 1775 believed, as those in 1740 had done, that the time had come for them and their brethren in the Diaspora, to furtively and literally behind the backs of the people, obtain new rights. The introduction of the Naturalization Law of 1740 was the cause of an unusually lively influx of Jews into England. According to this law, Jews who had lived in the English colonies in America for seven continuous years could obtain English citizenship without taking the customary religious oaths. During 1737-1753 the Jewish population increased by 2,000. That it was possible to circumvent the Naturalization laws by the Act of 1740 behind the backs of the English nation and even without the direct knowledge of Parliament, is clearly stated by the Earl of Egmont in his speech in Parliament, on November 26, 1753, which reads as follows:

“But sir, religion was not the only objection which the people had against this act for permitting the Jews to be naturalized: they likewise looked upon it as a sacrifice of the honour of the nation; for they judged that every Christian, and every Mahometan nation in the world, would hold this nation in contempt, and treat us in the same manner they now treat the Jews: they also judged, that if, in pursuance of this act, a great part of the riches and lands of this kingdom should come to the possession of the Jews, it might be of the most dangerous consequence to our constitution; and if they have never yet shown any discontent with the act for naturalization such Jews as shall reside seven years in our plantations, it is because that part of the act which relates to Jews was passed as it were by stealth, without ever making its appearance either in the votes of this house, or in the title of the act, so that very few of the people know that there is such an act”.

A like effort had previously been made by the Jews in 1751, in that they tried to make use of a Bill which was intended to make naturalization easier for the Protestants overseas. The proposals put forth in this Bill were not passed, and one must accept the fact that intensive activity took place behind the scenes and that leading members of Henry Pelham's Cabinet (1745-1754) and the most important parliamentarians such as the elder Pitt, the Earl of Newcastle, a brother of Henry Pelham, and Robert Walpole were influenced in favour of the Jews, so that as early as in the Spring of 1753 a Bill was introduced, which was entitled: “To permit persons professing the Jewish religion to be naturalized by Parliament, and for other purposes therein mentioned.” The actual tenor of this Naturalization Bill was, that it would be possible for any person, who preferred the Jewish religion, or who had lived for a continuous period of three years, without a longer absence than three months, in England or Ireland to receive citizenship after having handed in the necessary naturalization papers to Parliament. By the Bill the Jews intended to provide themselves with privileges, as opposed to, or as over and above those granted other nationalities. The promoters of this Bill were the Ministers of Pelham's cabinet themselves. It was therefore a new Jewish advantage towards extending the Naturalization Laws of 1740 still farther in their favour.

The Jewish historian Hertz, in this connection, writes the following:

“The promoters of the measure were no doubt influenced partly by Jewish appreciation of citizenship, and partly by their connection with Sampson Gideon, the oracle of Jonathan's coffeehouse in Exchange Alley, who had raised loans for the government in 1745 and 1749” . The Naturalization Bill was introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Halifax on April 3, 1753. The three readings took place on 3, 6, and 16 April, without any opposition. The Bill was laid before the House of Commons for the first reading on 17 April. The second reading took place on 7 May and during the reading it encountered the first sign of opposition.

The promoters of the Bill made use of the help the Jews had rendered the government in 1745. The Bill was accepted after the first reading by 95 to 16 votes. It appeared as if the English Parliament was to be “steamrollered” by the Bill. Strong opposition made itself felt in London City and in the counties from whence the House of Commons were petitioned. The English public wished to make use of the time between the second reading of the Naturalization Bill in the House of Commons and the third decisive reading, to influence Parliament against the Bill. In wider circles of the population the feeling existed that leading members of the Government and the nobility were using Jewish affairs for their own private ends. The discussions with regard to this Bill, at this time, did not only take place in Parliament. The London press and the press in the counties interested themselves in the matter and in the daily as well as the monthly papers articles for and against the Jews appeared. On this occasion the Jewish question in England was, for the first time, really discussed openly and from every point of view. On May 21, 1753 a petition in favour of the Bill was handed over to the House of commons on behalf of several London merchants. On May 21, 1753 the London Sheriffs also submitted a petition to the House of Commons, in which the Naturalization Bill was sharply criticized. From the open debate on the Naturalization Bill several points of view were brought to the notice of the promoters of the Bill and found expression in an article that appeared in “The Gentleman's Magazine”.

According to this article, the aim of the Naturalization Bill was to persuade the rich Jews living in other lands to immigrate to England. As a further argument in favour of the Bill the promoters brought forward the following: The Jews having no country of their own, the possibility of their return to a fatherland does not exist, consequently there is no question of English trade being diverted to such a country.

Under these circumstances the entrance of rich Jews into England from abroad, bringing their wealth with them, was to be welcomed, for they could then trade with overseas countries, thereby increasing the shipping, which in its turn would make itself felt by increasing the export of English wool and various manufactured articles; it would also increase trade in manufactured goods of the kingdom, which the Jews had already for years been exporting in large quantities.

These fools therefore directly advocated that the Jews should take possession of English trade.



We notice that the Jews have become the bankers and advisers of the English government. We also see that the Jews have been accepted into English society, and that it now is their aim, according to the example set by the old, established, aristocratic families, to acquire large estates. They cleverly took advantage of the fact that they had loaned the government large sums of money. They made it quite plain to the English statesmen that in consequence of these loans, they were obliged to grant the Jews the same privileges the old established landed gentry possessed. Soon the plutocratic poison, introduced into England by the Jews, began to take effect. The Jews however could only accomplish their ends by further circumventing the English laws. But as they feared the resentment of the English nation, this had to be done behind the backs of the people. This circumvention of the laws was carried out by a small clique of influential Jews working in conjunction with a Jew-controlled, corrupt government, against the will of the people, and from behind the scenes. Hand in glove with these endeavours, there are further attempts on the part of Jewry to circumvent the English Immigration- and Naturalisation Laws.

As the Naturalisation Law of 1740 had granted citizenship to Jews who had resided in an English colony in America for seven years, so the Bill of 1755, if passed, was to grant citizenship to Jews who had lived in England or Ireland for a continuous period of only three years without a longer absence than three months.

It is significant that the Naturalisation Bill was unanimously passed by the House of Lords and only met with opposition when it came before the House of Commons.

#### IV.

Let us hear what the two antagonists of the Jews had to say in their speeches in the House of Commons at the time of the second reading of the Naturalisation Bill on May 7, 1755. From the speeches of Sir Edmund Isham and Sir John Barnard, the leader of the Opposition, we now give several striking passages, which prove, that in the England of the 18th Century, there were reasons enough why, partly because the Jew was known, and partly from instinct, it was considered dangerous to grant the Jew in England any further rights. Sir Edmund Isham in his speech said:

"I must therefore, Sir, look upon this Bill to be in effect a Bill for a general naturalization of the Jews; and considering what infinite numbers of them are spread over the whole face of the earth, I am persuaded their numbers will increase so fast in this country, and they will get such a considerable part of our land estates into their possession, that they will soon contend for power as well as property. Let us consider, Sir, that the Jews are not like French refugees, or German protestants: these in a generation or two become so incorporated with us, that there is no distinguishing them from the rest of the people: their children, or grandchildren, are no longer French or Germans, or of the French or German nation, but become truly English, and deem themselves to be of the English nation. But the unconverted Jews can never incorporate with us: they must forever remain Jews, and will always deem themselves to be of the Hebrew not the English nation"<sup>32</sup>).

<sup>32</sup>) "The Parliamentary History of England", London 1815, Vol. XIV, pp. 1379/1385.

From this quotation from Isham's speech we see that although at the end of his speech Isham differentiates between baptised and unbaptised Jews, an instinctive glimmer of the truth breaks through: that, as far as the Jew is concerned, one is dealing with a totally different race, and that the Jew will never become assimilated in England. Sir Edmund Isham further explained in answer to the pro-Jewish speech of another member:

"When I consider this account, when I consider the numbers of them that are here already, and when I consider the numbers that will flock hither in consequence of this Bill, I do not wonder at the alarm taken by the peoples without doors; I am amazed how it has been possible, to prevent its breaking into this House. The noble lord has endeavoured to appease this alarm, by telling us, that the parliament can put a stop to the naturalization of any more Jews, if their numbers should increase so much as to become dangerous. **But if those of true English blood** have not now the power to prevent opening this sluice for letting the torrent in upon us, can we hope, that they will have power enough to shut it up, after the torrent is broke in, and the Jews are become possessed, not only of all the wealth, but of many, perhaps most of the land estates in the kingdom?"<sup>33</sup>)

The actual leader of the anti-Jew party and leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, Sir John Barnard, an enemy of Sampson Gideon and his Jewish clique, and impugner of the Walpolian corruption, also made a remarkable speech in the House of Commons against the Naturalisation Bill on May 7, 1755, from which we give a few interesting extracts:

"The Jews, Sir, are, and always have been, the most professed enemies to Christianity, and the greatest revilers of Christ himself: They are the offspring of those that crucified our Saviour, and to this day labour under the curse pronounced against them upon that account. I know, Sir, that, as a Christian, I am obliged to love my enemy; but whilst he continues to be so, no precept of Christianity enjoins me to take him under my roof, much less to put him in a way of making himself master both of me and my roof; and how the hon. gentleman who spoke last, could imagine, that the possession of a land estate should have an influence upon a man's religious principles, I cannot comprehend . . ."

"As landholders they will have the chusing of most of the members of this House, and may themselves be chosen. Whatever some gentlemen may think, if we consider their numbers, and the vast estates they have acquired in this kingdom within these last 50 or 60 years, this will appear to be no chimerical apprehension"<sup>34</sup>).

Then Sir John Barnard turns his attention to the assertion of the Jew-friendly, that the Jews could benefit English trade. Concerning this assertion he says:

"For the origin of trade in all countries is manufacture; but none of the Jews, even of the poorest sort, are ever bred to be manufacturers or mechanics, or indeed to any laborious employment; therefore they can never be the beginners of trade in any country. No instance can be given, Sir, of the Jews having been the beginners of trade in any country, but many to the contrary. In

<sup>33</sup>) "The Parliamentary History of England", Vol. XIV, pp. 1379/1385.

<sup>34</sup>) "The Parliamentary History of England", Vol. XIV, pp. 1387/1395.

Poland there have been multitudes of Jews for many ages, yet no man will say that Poland is a trading country. The truth is, in those countries where there is little or no trade, they deal mostly in usury, or in collecting the taxes: and where a trade has been already established, some indeed of the richer sort may engage in foreign commerce, but the poorer deal only as brookers, pedlars, or hawkers”<sup>35)</sup>.

Concerning the international character of Jewish wealth John Barnard says the following:

“The estate got by an Englishman we are sure will remain here: but a Jew, though naturalized, may be here to-day and gone to-morrow: When he has got an estate here, he may go and live upon it in a climate which he thinks more agreeable to his constitution. But, Sir, both in our foreign and domestic trade the transferring of a part of the profits from the Christian to the Jew, is not the only bad consequence we have to fear from this Bill: sectaries of all kinds, especially the Jews, are more zealous and diligent in recommending one another, and in playing into the hands of one another, than those of the established Church. By this means they may in time render it impossible for any Christian to carry on any trade, either foreign or domestic, to advantage: Jews may become our only merchants and our only shop-keepers. They will probably leave the laborious part of all manufactures and mechanical trades to the poor Christian, but they will be the paramount masters, as the merchants and shop-keepers in every country must always be: Thus, Sir, the Bill, instead of being of advantage, may probably be fatal to our present land-holders; and whatever esteem some gentlemen here may have for the Jews, I doubt much if our English farmers would like to have Jews for their landlords. From all which I must conclude, that there is no rank of men in the kingdom, to whom this Bill, if passed into a law, can be of any advantage. And as to the advantage it may be of to the state, by supplying our ministers with money in case of a war, or by enabling them to reduce the interest payable upon our public funds, in case of the continuance of peace, I must observe, that if the Jews cannot get an equal interest and security any where else, they will let us have their money without being naturalized; and if they can get a higher interest and equal security any where else, they will not let us have their money, even though we should naturalize the whole Hebrew nation at once”<sup>36)</sup>.

After the third reading of the Naturalisation Bill in the House of Commons, the Opposition introduced a motion, by which, through an amendment to the Naturalisation Law, the original purpose of the Bill would be cancelled. This amendment was defeated in the House of Commons by 95 to 16 votes. Then a motion was introduced calling for the adjournment of the debate to a later date. The Earl of Egmont, speaking in support of the motion in the House of Commons, said:

“Sir, it is equally chimerical to propose any advantage from the manufactures or labour of the Jews, which have been both idly mentioned: whence are these manufacturing, these labouring Jews to come?”

<sup>35)</sup> “The Parliamentary History of England”, Vol. XIV, pp. 1387/1395.

<sup>36)</sup> a) “The Parliamentary History of England”, Vol. XIV, pp. 1391/1395.

b) “Gentleman’s Magazine and Historical Chronicle”, Vol. 25, pp. 477/481.

Question whether any number of Jews at this time exercise any manufacture, or follow any laborious profession in any part of the known world: and in truth, from their obstinate superstition, and the total difference of their customs in every circumstance of life, it would be utterly impossible for them to mix with our people. Sir, if we flatter ourselves with any notions of this kind, we do it in opposition to all experience, both of ancient and modern times. The trade of the Jews, as it appears by the oldest of our histories, and the earliest records both here and in other countries, was usury, brokerage, and jobbing, in a higher or a lower degree. By this traffic, in former ages, they distressed and ruined the Christian subjects in such numbers every where, as to draw down upon them from time to time the resentment of all nations, and in this traffic they have improved so far in this age, as now to ruin whole kingdoms instead of individuals, by aiding ministers to beggar the states they serve, by which traffic also they have greatly aided to plunge this nation into a debt of near eighty millions. For in truth, it will not be found, that of all the immense fortunes made by the Jews now subsisting among us, any one has been otherwise acquired than by contracts, subscriptions, commissions, and correspondencies, and all kinds of jobbing with the necessities of the public in the late war . . . .

I am to suppose that this Bill must have this effect, that the Jews who are now here, or who are to come here, will lay out vast sums of money in land. Now, Sir, if this should not be the case, what has been already said proves that the Bill will have no effect, which is alone a sufficient reason why it should not pass: but if it should have this consequence, I do maintain it to be the most formidable and highly dangerous measure that ever was pursued; for it directly tends to the ruin, and even annihilation of the present landed interest of England. Of what importance is it to Englishmen, that the price of land in England should be raised, to this end, only, that by this advance of the price the people may be tempted to throw those lands for ever into the hands of the Jews? The present English generation, who have now possession of the landed estates of England, are for once, indeed, to have the insidious advantage of being bought out of them at an advanced price: but nationally they and their posterity, for ever after, are to be deprived of their inheritances here, and the Jews are to remain for ever the landholders of Great Britain, and for ever after to enjoy our titles to this kingdom. In whatever degree this Bill is to operate by the sale of our lands to Jews, it operates more or less to turn the tables upon the Christians in favour of the Jews, — to put the Jews upon the ground of the English, and the English upon the present footing of the Jews. And suppose this Bill should only have an extensive operation of this sort, which it must have, and not an universal operation which it may have in length of time, yet great estates in all the counties of England will of necessity fall, and that very soon too, into Jewish hands: then let me ask, whether it is possible that great estates should not give great influence? Let me follow it with another question whether great influence, in whatever hands, will not be called upon to exert itself by the ministers of this country in all future elections? Let me pursue it farther with a

third, whether this influence so acquired, so called upon to exert itself, will not be exerted?"<sup>37)</sup>

\*

From the convincing speeches of the leaders of the Opposition, Sir Edmund Isham, Sir John Barnard and the Earl of Egmont in the House of Commons, it is plain that all three quite clearly saw the Jewish danger threatening their country. These three men describe the Jews as a parasitic, non-assimilable element in the English nation. They describe the Jews as being averse to manual labour and as being exploiters of English trade. They deny the assertion that the Jews are the promoters of trade, they prove that the Jews accumulated their wealth by exploiting the nation, and by speculation, brokerage and usury. Because they had placed the Jew in the position of "indispensable middleman and broker" in trade, they had unnecessarily increased the prices of goods. By this by-way of "middleman trade", step by step, the Jew tried to get control of all English trade and also to control prices, to corner all English business and to degrade Englishmen into the position of second-class handymen, who were only good enough to serve in the capacity of common labourers in a Jew-controlled Great-Britain. From the speeches of the three Opposition leaders in the House of Commons it is quite plain that they realised that the Jews would one day be the absolute masters of the British Empire. Already the Jews aimed at gaining possession of large estates and in doing so to supplant the landed gentry. In penetrating warnings the leaders of the Opposition, as the true parliamentary representatives of the English people, pledged themselves to defeat these Jewish efforts. In vain they pointed out the dangers which would result from these new Jewish attempts to conquer England. Already the power of Jewry and its work from behind the scenes in Parliament was too pronounced. In vain the three Opposition leaders pointed out the enormous debt into which the Jews had plunged the English nation and that they, through the rights which they would obtain by the adoption of the Naturalisation Bill, would increase their power to such a degree that they would ruin the whole kingdom and place themselves upon the Throne as the rulers of England. In vain these representatives of the people opposed the endeavour of the Jews to turn England into a plutocratic State. Their prophetic words fell upon deaf ears in Parliament.

## V.

In spite of the convincing speech of the Earl of Egmont in support of the Opposition's Amendment Act, the Bill was defeated by 96 to 55 Votes. **Thereby the Naturalisation Bill became law.** But Pelham's government had not reckoned with the English nation. The steamroller methods used by the English Parliament with regard to the Naturalisation Bill led to a national disturbance in England in the 18th Century<sup>38)</sup>. In London and the Counties resentment made itself felt through pamphlets, petitions from trade fraternities, petitions from judges, mayors and councillors to their respective members of Parliament, both to the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The English people saw through the Jew's game and recognised the fact that their Prime Minister was open to bribes. Demonstrations against the Naturalisation Bill took

place in the streets of London. The clergy were attacked on account of their pro-Jewish attitude. The whole of the English press expressed itself in articles against this law which was directed against the interests of the English nation.

From the series of anti-Jewish petitions to politicians and members of Parliament there are three worthy of being mentioned: A petition of the Grand Jury of the County of Essex, dated August 15, 1755, addressed to Sir John Abdy and the County Sheriff Wm. Harvey, Esq.; another petition addressed to Sir Robert Long and Edward Popham, Representatives for the County of Wilts, at the Summer Assizes at Salisbury dated August 2, 1755; and a third petition from the town of Reading. The second petition appeared in the "London Evening Post" and in the "Country Newspapers" as well as in the "Gentlemen's Magazine"<sup>39)</sup>.

From these petitions of the Sheriffs and the Grand Council of the County of Wilts we give the following extract:

"Its surprising that any man, who calls himself a Christian, should be so fond of naturalizing these Jews, who are the only avowed enemies to the Christian religion. The Heathens are infidels from ignorance: but the Jews are so from their obstinacy and perverseness: They were the people who crucified our blessed Saviour, and have, ever since that time, been the most violent persecutors of all those who believe in him and his doctrine: These are the people on whom God has entailed the most dreadful of curses: The prophecies relating to them have been verified, their temple destroyed; they have been dispersed over the face of the whole earth, and are, at this day, wanderers and vagabonds, having no settled habitation in the world: What then can we expect, if we do all in our power to defeat these prophecies, to take off this curse? May we not with reason, apprehend that we shall draw upon ourselves the resentment of Almighty God for our endeavours to establish the body politick of the Jews, in the same manner as Julian the apostate did for his presumption, in attempting to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem?"

The inveterate enmity of Jews to Christians, their incorrigible insolence in every dawning of prosperity, their violences, usuries and oppressions practised in former times, in Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and here in England, afford us sufficient grounds to apprehend their return to the same diabolical practices of their forefathers. Their admission among us, we foresee, will be attended with riot and confusion: Let us not so degenerate from our ancestors, as to take these serpents into our bosoms; but let us rather exert ourselves as becomes true Christians and true Britons, to defend our laws, religion, and liberties, from being trampled upon by Jewish or foreign tyranny."

In the petition of the Grand Jury of the County of Essex we find the following:

"The Jews have been zealous persecutors of Christianity from its infancy; and, where their power fell short of their malice, their instigations have prevailed on those, to whom their sceptre was departed, to execute their most wicked purpose: Their inveteracy to Christians, of all denominations still continues.

<sup>37)</sup> "The Parliamentary History of England", Vol. XIV, pp. 1418-1431.

<sup>38)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", p. 66.

<sup>39)</sup> "London Evening Post", Aug. 1755.

"Country Newspapers", Aug. 1755.

"Gentleman's Magazine", 1755, Vol. 25, p. 467.

JEWISH Crimes enumerated,

perverfeneſy: They were the people who crucified our bleſſed Saviour, and have ever ſince that time, been the moſt violent perſecutors of all thoſe who believe in him and his doctrine: Theſe are the people on whom God has entailed the moſt dreadful of curſes: The prophecies relating to them have been verified, their temple deſtroyed; they have been diſperſed over the face of the whole earth, and are, at this day, wanderers and vagabonds, having no ſettled habitation in the world: What then can we expect, if we do all in our power to deſtroy theſe prophecies, to take off this curſe? May we not with reaſon, apprehend that we ſhall draw upon ourſelves the reſentment of Almighty God for our endeavours to eſtablish the body poliſtick of the Jews, in the ſame manner as Julian the apoſtate did for his preſumption, in attempting to rebuild the temple of Jeruſalem?

The inveterate enmity of Jews to Chriſtians, their incorrigible inſolence in every ſhewing of proſperity, their violence, uſury and oppreſſions praſtiſed in former times, in Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and here in England, afford us ſufficient grounds to apprehend their return to the ſame diabolical practices of their forefathers. Their admiſſion among us, we foreſee, will be attended with riot and confuſion: This was the caſe under our former kings. They were deſervedly baniſhed out of this kingdom in the reign of Edward the firſt; and one of the many reaſons given for their baniſhment was, That they had ſteer'd his majeſty's ſubjects to the bone. So caſtrous were the people of England, at that time, to get rid of theſe oppreſſors; that the parliament granted to the king a ſiſterthip, in conſideration of having expelled the Jews. Let us not ſo degenerate from our ancestors, as to take theſe ſerpents into our bowels; but let us rather exert ourſelves as becomes true Chriſtians and true Britiſh, to defend our laws, religion, and Liberties, from being trampled upon by Jewiſh or foreign tyranny.

Perſecution is far from our intention; we can ſincerely and affectionately pray for the ſalvation, for the conversion of the Jews; but we by no means think the preſent indulgence to them likely to effect this: We cannot therefore but be zealouſly deſirous to ſee an expeditious abrogation of the bill in their favour. Our requeſt to you, gentlemen, is, That you would exert yourſelves on this important occaſion. If you find it beyond your power to ſtifle this inſane law, yet we ſhatter ourſelves your efforts may prevent its progreſs; a vigorous oppoſition to each previous bill may poſſibly defeat the intention of the publick we already enacted. It was preſumption, or diſſidence in your ſtatutes, to be more particular. The intereſting buſineſs we commit to your management; requeſting at the ſame time, that you will deſign carefully to preſerve our ancient conſtitution, both in church and ſtate; for we are well aſſured its conſtitution muſt be in danger, unleſs its quaſities

are the utmoſt endeavours to defend it.

- |                        |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Edw. Polhill, ſheriff, | Thomas Hudger,   |
| Nich. Roald,           | G. Flower,       |
| John Talbot,           | H. Couſburn,     |
| Chas. Brindley,        | Tho. Villers,    |
| Hen. Wyndham,          | John Jacob,      |
| To. Egerton,           | Lewis Long,      |
| Dudington Egerton,     | Walter Long,     |
| Will. Jones,           | Oliver Richmond, |
| W. Nurthy,             | Tho. Cooper,     |
| G. K. Kneller,         | Richard Long,    |
| T. Goddard,            | Nich. Elliott,   |

An Application from the Grand Jury of the County of Wilts, at the Aſſizes holden at Chelmsford; the 15th of Auguſt.

To Sir John Abdy, Bart. and Wm. Harvey, Eſq; Knights of the Shire; the High Sheriff not being there.

GENTLEMEN,

YOUR ready adherence in parliament to the true intereſt of your country makes us gladly embrace this opportunity of declaring our approbation of your conduct.

Your oppoſition to a bill, brought in the laſt ſeſſion of parliament, conſerring unprecedented privileges on the Jews, was agreeable to our ſentiments, and, as far as we can judge, to thoſe of the kingdom in general.

As we can only gueſs at the real motives of the patrons and promoters of this bill, we ſhall paſs no cenſure upon them; but we have reaſon to believe, that their votes were not accompanied with the deſire or conſent of their conſtituents; which, in a country of liberty and freedom, ought to have an inconfiderable weight in parliamentary affairs.

The Jews have been zealous perſecutors of Chriſtians from its infancy; and, where their power fell ſhort of their malice, their inſtigations have prevailed on thoſe, to whom their ſceptre was departed, to execute their moſt wicked purpoſe: Their inveteracy to Chriſtians, of all denominations, ſtill continues.

They ſtand branded to hiſtory with being rebellious ſubjects; faithleſt allies, and treacherous vailers; with pillaging provinces and kingdoms, where they have been farmers of the revenues; with being inſolent on the leaſt proſperity, and vindictive under chaſtiſement.

They became juſtly odious to this nation in former times, by diminiſhing and altering our coin; by their extorſions, uſuries, and other enormous crimes. At length a ſtatute was made only for putting a ſtop to their uſury; and this amounted to a total expulſion: They departed the kingdom, which was no remedy for them, when they could no longer oppreſs (by their darling method) with impunity.

It has been ſaid, we are to reap great advantages from the naturalization of wealthy Jews, (See p. 152) by the increaſe of our commerce, and the riches they will bring into the kingdom: How can it be imagined that, when they ſhall become proprietors of great eſtates in land, ſuch events will ever be

Specimen page from "The Gentleman's Magazine, and Historical Chronicle", Vol. XXIII, of 1753, showing a portion of the petition from the Sheriff and the Grand Jury to Sir Robert Long, and Edward Popham, Esq., Representatives of the County of Wilts and the Grand Jury of the County of Essex to Sir John Abdy, Bart. and Wm. Harvey, Esq., Knights of the Shire.

They stand branded in history with being rebellious subjects, faithless allies, and treacherous vassals; with pillaging provinces and kingdoms, where they have been farmers of the revenues; with being insolent on the least prosperity, and vindictive under chastisement.

They became justly odious to this nation in former times, by diminishing and altering our coin; by their extortions, usuries, and other enormous crimes.

These considerations, gentlemen, added to their horrid blasphemies, too shocking to repeat; their vices and immoralities, too many to be enumerated, have moved us earnestly to define, you will use your utmost efforts to procure a speedy repeal of the late act in favour of the Jews; or, if that cannot be effected, to prevent its progress and consequences, as the properest means of preserving our religious and civil establishment, and continuing the tranquillity we have enjoyed under the government of our present most gracious sovereign<sup>40)</sup>.

The petition of the Mayors, Councillors and Members of Parliament of the town of Reading in Council assembled, dated September 29, 1755, "to the present worthy Candidates that offer themselves to be their Representatives in Parliament at the next general Election", reads:

"We need not point out to you the many grievances we labour under; the burthen you sustain in common with the rest of your fellow subjects must make you truly sensible of them: But what we think ourselves bound in duty (as Christians) to take notice of, is, the late act of naturalization of the Jews.

This step, so unexpected, has greatly alarmed the whole nation, and put us upon following the laudable examples of others in delivering our sentiments concerning it: And altho we shall always pay a due obedience to the legislature, in strictly observing whatever shall become a law, yet we think, as Englishmen, we have a natural right to speak our minds, when we apprehend or see any grievance that may affect either our holy religion, or the present happy establishment: And therefore as you are friends to both, 'tis hoped you will publicly declare your dislike to that act: and that you will not only use your utmost endeavours to get it repealed, but to oppose any subsequent bill in favour of any one of the Jews.

To enumerate all the massacres and persecutions of the Jews upon the score of religion, the many extortions and cruelties arising from their usury, and the treasons and conspiracies from their covetousness, would be an endless task, and in great measure a repetition of what has been already published upon this occasion: And therefore we think it needless to trespass any longer upon your patience, by setting forth the many inconveniencies and ill consequences attending this act; resting assured that (whichsoever of you are chosen our representatives) you will act agreeable to the high opinion we have of your great abilities and good conduct.

Richard Clarke. Town-Clerk<sup>41)</sup>.

\*

<sup>40)</sup> "Gentleman's Magazine", 4755, pp. 467/468.

<sup>41)</sup> a) "Gentleman's Magazine", 1755, p. 469.

b) "Reading Journal", Oct. 6, 1755.

*The Declaration of the High Sheriff, and grand Jury of the County of Kent, at Maidstone, Aug. 20, 1755.*

**W**E the sheriff and grand jury, assembled at the assizes held at Maidstone, the 20th day of Aug. 1755, for the county of Kent, take this opportunity of returning our thanks to Sir Edward Dering and Sir Roger Twissden, our present worthy representatives, for their long and disinterested services in parliament, and of declaring our just sense and approbation of their irreproachable and steady conduct.

It is matter of real concern to us that Sir Roger Twissden's bad state of health deprives us of a candidate of such tried fidelity and honour at the next general election, but we are determined unanimously to promote with all possible vigour the election of Sir Edward Dering, who has on all occasions approved himself most firmly attached to our present happy constitution in church and state, the protestant succession in the illustrious house of Hanover, the liberty of the subject, and to all the civil and religious rights of the good people of Great Britain, of which we have a sufficient instance in his zealous opposition to a late unprecedented and dangerous measure, conferring particular national privileges on the avowed enemies to Christianity

John Shaw; Sheriff of the C. of Kent.	George Sayer, The, Streetfield,
J. Heywood,	John Aulse,
Thomas Knight,	Lewis Coge,
Thomas Boff,	James Pettit,
John Pratt,	Wm Marland,
Richard Morris,	James Chapman,
Thomas Barrett,	James Adams,
Jacob Sawbridge,	John Edwards,
Francis Barrett,	John Telfer,
Alex. Courtisope,	

Specimen page from "The Gentleman's Magazine and Historicle Chronicle", Vol. XXIII, of 1755, giving the Declaration of High Sheriff, and Grand Jury of the County of Kent, August 20, 1755, against the Naturalisation Bill.

It is perfectly plain that the English nation knew its Jews. That is why it was roused to a state of indignation amounting almost to revolt against the manoeuvres of its corrupt and, even at that time, already Jew-controlled government.

The representatives of the county corporations and the boroughs of the British kingdom, the Grand Jury of the County of Wilts, the sheriffs, mayors, and councillors all stressed the misdeeds of the Jews. They mention as characteristic: the vice of the Jews, their avarice, covetousness, cruelty, vengeance, indelicacy, brutality and immorality. They charge them with extortion, with clipping the coinage and other crimes. They accuse them of amassing fortunes by dishonest means, of plundering whole provinces and kingdoms, and of treating the natives of such countries with great brutality. They point out that the Jews are a revolutionary element, that they stir up agitation and unrest. They prove to the English statesmen that the Jews are "rebellious subjects, faithless allies and treacherous vassals", that they instigate treachery and hatch plots, and that the English nation lived in great fear that they would be delivered up to Jewish tyranny.

Be it remembered that these accusations are levied against the Jews by the representatives of a Grand Jury. Could there possibly be a fraternity more competent of raising these objections? How often did this Grand Jury not have to deal with Jewish crimes and criminals? How many times did not other juries have to do the same?

One thing must, however, be said at this stage: The English nation knew its Jews! It still maintained a healthy instinct and therefore resisted the Jewish penetration and the ever increasing development of the Jewish power with all its might. The fight of the national-minded English people against plutocracy now entered upon its decisive stage.

## VI.

But not only the London Corporations and the Counties protested against the Naturalisation Law, every speech of the Opposition in the House of Commons against the Law was commented upon in many pamphlets in the towns and in the country. Dating back to that time there are no less than 60 anti-Jewish pamphlets still in existence<sup>42)</sup>.

The dignitaries of the High Church, who had supported the Bill in Parliament, fared even worse.

"The Bishop of Norwich was insulted for having voted for it, in several parts of his diocess whither he went to confirm; the boys of Ipswich in particular calling out to him for circumcision, and a paper being fixed up to one of the churches, that the next day being Saturday, his lordship would confirm the Jews, and the day following the Christians<sup>43)</sup>."

In the pamphlets many weighty arguments against the Naturalisation Law were presented. It was, for instance, suggested that: "the Jews would become so numerous as to exclude Protestants from all offices, trades, and professions. Rich Jews, it was feared, would settle in the country, purchase all the estates, and influence elections. They would even become members of Parliament, and perhaps attain to still higher office. On the other hand, poor Jews would flock into England to such an extent that they would deprive the natives of all means of earning a livelihood, and would introduce such a mass of pauperism as to impair the resources of the country, and seriously increase its taxation. These same Jews would endanger the constitution of the Church and State, and would increase in number and wealth to such an extent as to make their own customs universal in the land, and establish Judaism as the fashionable religion of the English." . . . "It was suggested that all the rich Jews in the world would come to England, set up a Messiah and start a revolution<sup>44)</sup>."

"Another writer drew a terrible picture of the evils that were about to befall the country in consequence of the Act. After a lengthy recapitulation of the varied vices attributed to Jews from time to time, the author proceeded to detail a selection of blood accusations. In passing, he compared the attitude of the Jews at the period at which he wrote with that of their ancestors towards Hamor ben Shechem. The Jews, he feared, would soon

gain control of the estates, and both by their Money and Sway among their Tenants be able to carry many Elections for Parliament-men, if not get into the House themselves. "Would not a Christian", he asked, "be overawed frequently by a Jew Justice of a Peace? And might it not be feared that, in future Ages, some of these Israelites might buy themselves a Place too near the Throne? And if an artful Rabbi should spirit his Nation up with the Expectation of a future Restoration of the Jewish Kingdom, as History informs us has been often done, who would be able to defend the Crown itself from a People, that have in all Times and Places, where the least success has buoyed them up, left Examples of their imperious and rebellious Spirit?"<sup>45)</sup>

In an open letter to Sir John Barnard, an antagonist of the Naturalisation Law wrote, that if Parliament did not soon repeal this law, it would not be many generations before it would have to be acknowledged what good use the Jews had made of the privileges granted to them. The poor, wandering, restless nation would then be blessed with vineyards and olive groves, it would "enjoy the choicest Sweets of the Land of Canaan", and the nobles and favourites of the Crown would be Jews.

The writer "Britannia" continues the argument against the Jews:

"Shall we tamely resign our Rights and Privileges, the very Essence of our happy Constitution, our dear-bought Liberty, which our Progenitors many of them purchased at the Expence of their Lives, which their Successors, so vigorously maintained and asserted in despite of all opponents, and the many strong Trials to deprive them thereof? Shall we, their lawful Heirs, squander away this glorious Freedom, and, like idle Boys, in wanton Sport, give away that which was so dearly bought, to a People whose Country and Habitation are destroyed by the Command of their offended God?<sup>46)</sup>"

The gem of the whole collection of anti-Jewish pamphlets of this period is undoubtedly "Seasonable Remarks on the Act lately passed in Favour of the Jews; containing Diverse Weighty Reasons for a review of the said Act". In this pamphlet it was argued that Parliament, through such favouritism to the Jews, as was expressed in the Naturalisation Law, would bring about a state of affairs, that after a certain time a great number of English-born Christians would have to work even harder for their living than at present. It was further suggested that Jewry, by reason of its undoubted antiquity, had the right to claim that their religion be accepted as a State-religion. It reads literally:

„It is demonstrated by those who are best skilled in political Arithmetic, that the Number of Jews that are known to be dispersed in the different Parts of the World (exclusive of the ten Tribes, who, when they hear of this Act, will undoubtedly discover themselves and take Advantage of it) is more than sufficient to occupy all the Lands, Houses, etc., in this Kingdom. And since it is no less evident that they are possessed of a Fund more than sufficient for the Purchase of them it is apprehended that all or at least the greatest Part of them will endeavour to be naturalised in the next Session of Parliament, in order to make the valuable Purchase above-mentioned<sup>47)</sup>."

<sup>42)</sup> "The Jewish Chronicle", 6. April 1906, p. 24.

<sup>43)</sup> a) "Hardwicke Papers", "Parliamentary History of England", p. 1451.

b) "Coxe's Memoirs of the Pelham Administration", p. 290.

<sup>44)</sup> "The Jewish Chronicle", April 6, 1906, p. 24.

<sup>45)</sup> a) "The Jewish Chronicle", April 6, 1906, p. 24.

b) "An Appeal to the Throne" by Britannia.

<sup>46)</sup> "The Jewish Chronicle", 6. April 1906, p. 24.

<sup>47)</sup> "The Jewish Chronicle", April 6, 1906, p. 24.

## How the English nation foresaw Jewish Domination.

This picture is taken from a pamphlet printed in 1755, i. e., at the time of the bitter struggle of the English nation against the ever-growing penetration of the Jews into England. The statue of Queen Anne has been thrown from its pedestal and that of Sampson Gideon, leaning on the Ten Commandments, and with the Queen's crown on his head, raised up in its stead. This is how the pamphleteers saw the matter a hundred years later in 1855. They therefore foresaw the domination of England by plutocracy, embodied in the person of the Jew Sampson Gideon in 1755. For what was the position in England about a hundred years later? A descendant of the Jew Sampson Gideon, H. C. F. Childers, became

Gladstone's Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in 1868 the Jew Disraeli became Prime Minister of England.

It is also interesting that the pamphleteers chose to use the Statue of Queen Anne, before St. Paul's Cathedral, for their cartoon. The Jew's in Cromwell's time tried to purchase St. Paul's Cathedral from the English government, for the sum of 500,000 pounds, for the purpose of converting it into a synagogue. (Robert Monnet: "The History of the Troubles of Great Britain", London 1759, p. 473; also, "Anglia Judaica" or "The History and Antiquities of the Jews in England" by Tovey, (James Fletcher, Oxford. 1758.)

This picture is taken from the "Jewish Chronicle" of April 6, 1906.



"A SCENE OF SCENES OF THE YEAR 1853."

One of the numerous satirical prints issued at the time of the "Jew Bill" controversy (1753), indicating the artist's conception of events as they would be a century later. The scene is outside St. Paul's. It will be noticed that the statue of Queen Anne is cast down and that of Sampson Gideon raised in its stead. [Reproduced from the unique Collection of rare contemporary Engravings in the possession of Mr. Israel Solomons]

In the same pamphlet the wandering Jew was described in the following manner:

"There is, it is well-known to the Learned, a certain Person, commonly and emphatically stiled the wandering Jew, who although already upwards of 1,700 Years old is, however, sure of living several hundred Years longer, indeed quite up to the very Time in which not only this, but all the other Nations in the World are to become Vassals to him and his Brethren. Now if this strange old Vagrant should chance to be tired of his present peddling way of Life, and choose to take advantage of this Act (which by the by it will be impossible to prevent, as he is not personally known to any one Man now living)

what alas! may not be apprehended from a Man in his extraordinary Circumstances? From one who must have acquired such a prodigious Knowledge of the World, who is probably possessed of immense Sums, under a thousand different Names, in all the public Funds and Bankers Hands in Christendom, and whom it would be quite ridiculous to think of hanging, or even imprisoning, if he should be guilty of the most treasonable and detestable Practices. Short-sighted People may indeed imagine, that the Vagrant kind of Life to which he is condemned effectually secures us from all Danger with regard to him; as if, after he was possessed of half the landed Estates in this Kingdom, he would not be full

as much at liberty, as any of our present Nobility and Gentry, to ramble all over the World, or, if he should not choose to cross the Water again at his Time of Life, to be at least perpetually moving about from one Place of public Diversion to another<sup>48)</sup>.”

\*

Up to this time it was only the recognised Corporations that opposed the granting of citizenship to Jews, but now the English nation itself gave expression to its indignation against the Jews by numbers of pamphlets. In all these pamphlets the same fears are expressed. The English nation very clearly sees a time coming when the Jews, against whose expansion, facilitated by the passing of the Naturalisation Law, there is now no more barrier, will take complete possession of England. It sees the day coming when the Jews will be members of Parliament and in this way use their political influence to the detriment of the English nation. With the natural, healthy instinct, which the English nation then still possessed, it sees the time coming when the Jews will secure positions too near the Throne, and when they will even dominate the Throne itself. The English nation at that time still possessed a healthy instinct, although Jewry made use of Puritanism, chiefly based on the Old Testament, to work on the religious feelings of the people. How great this influence already was is best seen from the attitude taken by the higher Clergy of the Church as regards the Naturalisation Law. The English nation feared that the Jews would one day convert the British Empire into a Jewish Empire, and that the Jews would be successful in making vassals of every other nation. We hear the warning voice of the anti-Jewish Englishmen of the 18th Century speaking with unmistakable clarity.

How great the bitterness of the English people was at that time, we best see from the fact, that they do not hesitate to attack the dignitaries of the Church. In this campaign regarding the Naturalisation Law, the higher clergy fought for the passing of the law and therefore on the side of the Jews, while the lesser clergy took the field in defence of the nation and against the Jews. We therefore see that the dignitaries of the High Church, who today are the most enthusiastic protectors of the Jews, are merely following an old tradition.

## VII.

The Opposition among the Parliamentarians and the wave of indignation in the English nation made such an impression upon the government, that it saw the necessity of introducing a Bill, according to which the Naturalisation Law was to be repealed. Immediately after the opening of the new session on November 15, 1753, the Duke of Newcastle, brother to the Prime Minister, Henry Pelham, presented the Bill, which dealt with the repeal of the Act, to the House of Lords<sup>49)</sup>. Parliamentarians and Ministers feared to lose their seats, as in 1754 the customary general election was due. The Members of the House of Commons, the House of Lords and Ministers were aware of the anger and resentment of the people with regard to the Jewish policy of the government and had to reckon with the fact that they would not be re-elected at the next general election.

<sup>48)</sup> "The Jewish Chronicle", April 6, 1906, p. 24.

<sup>49)</sup> "Coxe's Memoirs", Vol. II, pp. 291, 467, 483, 484, 485.

Secker, Bishop of Oxford, Drummond, Bishop of St. Asaph, and the Lord Chancellor Hardwicke spoke in defence of the Jews. Earl Temple also championed the Jews and protested against giving in to the dictates of the mob, and appealed to the lords to oppose the prejudice and assertions of the "very lowest people<sup>50)</sup>." The Bill, after having passed the House of Lords, was introduced into the House of Commons. There the Earl of Egmont on Nov. 26, 1753 once more addressed the House. The following extract from his speech, in which he attacked the Jew-friendly members, is of special interest:

"They do not complain of the synagogues which the Jews, by a suspension of the penal laws relating to religion, are allowed to have openly and avowedly in London: they do not complain of the fine houses and gardens which the Jews, by a suspension of the penal laws relating to aliens, are allowed to possess: nor have the people as yet begun to complain of the land estates which some Jews have of late purchased. But I would advise the Jews, and other Dissenters, too, to be satisfied with the indulgence they now meet with; for if the people should once begin to think that, by this indulgence, the established church may at last be in danger of being overturned and persecuted, a real high-church persecuting spirit will take hold of them; for in all countries, and as much in this as any other, the spirit of the people is but too apt to fly from one extreme to another. If the people be really in the wrong, Sir, they will sooner, and more probably find it out, by your leaving them entirely to their own serious consideration, than by your positively insisting upon it, that they have been imposed on."

"But, Sir, religion was not the only objection which the people had against this act for permitting the Jews to be naturalized: they also judged, and rightly judged, that if, in pursuance of this act, a great part of the riches and lands of this kingdom should come to the possession of the Jews, it might be of the most dangerous consequence to our constitution<sup>51)</sup>."

In another part of his speech the Earl of Egmont denied the statement made by the supporters of the Jews that the Jews would bring money into England to be expended for the good of the nation.

Against the statement made by many supporters of the Bill, that much wealth would be brought into the country, the Earl argued in the following words:

"The maxim I mean is, that money does all things, and that therefore the bringing of money into the nation is to be preferred to every other consideration. But I wish that those gentlemen would reflect upon another maxim, I believe much less exceptionable, that money is the root of all evil; for whoever does reflect upon this, will be against bringing any money into the nation that may probably be hereafter employed against us<sup>52)</sup>."

The Bill, in which the Naturalisation Law was repealed, was passed by the House of Commons on December 20, 1753, and received the royal assent.

To what extent the people had been aroused by the emancipation efforts of the Jews, and how clearly they had recognised that important politicians had been bribed by the Jews, is evident from the songs that were

<sup>50)</sup> "The Parliamentary History of England", Vol. XV, pp. 92—94 and Vol. XV, pp. 99—105.

<sup>51)</sup> "The Parliamentary History of England", Vol. XV, pp. 155—159.

<sup>52)</sup> "The Parliamentary History of England", Vol. XV, pp. 155—159.



sung in the streets of London, and from which we quote one or two verses:

"But Lord, how surprised when they heard of the News  
That we were to be servants to circumcised Jews,  
To be negroes and slaves instead of true Blues,  
Which nobody can deny<sup>53)</sup>."

"Our Rulers have dar'd the Decree to revoke,  
Which was in the Judea so frequently spoke  
T'incorporate with us that fugitive Tribe:  
But what is it Britons won't do for a Bribe?  
Sing Tantarara, Jews all! Jews all!"<sup>54)</sup>

In the liberalist, historical account of events the cause of this indignation of the English people, which arose from a healthy instinct of selfpreservation against the Jews has naturally been misrepresented and belittled. The best proof of this is seen from the Memoirs of the well-known historian and member of the House of Commons, Horace Walpole.

We read on page 111, that Walpole remarks that the English Parliament, which met on Nov. 15, 1753, busied itself until the end of the year with a matter, which proved, that that period known as the "enlightened age" was governed by the most brutal and most common prejudices; that in the previous year a Bill in favour of the naturalisation of Jews was passed by Parliament; that the Bill passed without attracting much notice, as Sir John Barnard and Lord Egmont put up a very weak opposition, so that they could retain the favour of the London and Westminster crowd. Walpole further states that bishops helped to dispel the foolish differences, which branded and chained down subjects of the Empire, who were loyal, rich, and so useful in trade. A new general election was on hand: a few unimportant people, who perhaps needed money to buy themselves seats in Parliament, or for renting public places where they could agitate, had attached themselves to this Bill. In a few months the whole nation was inflamed with Christian zeal which everybody believed had died a peaceful death in the time of Queen Anne and Sacheverel. Walpole adds that this religious fervour took hold only of the masses and the lower clergy: all these took the wise sayings, which prophesied the misery and eternal banishment of the Jews so sorely to heart, that they seemed to fear that it really could be stopped by an act of Parliament; and nothing could satisfy their zeal but to petition Parliament to determine its fulfilment. The village priests preached against the bishops, saying that they had become untrue to their calling; and aldermen got drunk in county clubs in honour of Jesus Christ, as they had once done in honour of King James. And the cabinet gave way to this unreasonable clamour and condescended to withdraw the Bill for the purpose of carrying through the general election.

The attitude of this English historian is explained by the fact, that Horace Walpole belonged to the same corrupt and Jew-controlled clique of aristocrats to which Sir Robert Walpole belonged. He was a brother to Edward Walpole, whose mistress was a Jewess, the sister of the Jewess Hannah Norsa, the mistress of Robert Walpole. Horace Walpole, therefore, befriended Jewry and for this reason he deliberately misrepresented historical events.

<sup>53)</sup> "Jewish Chronicle", of April 6, 1906.

<sup>54)</sup> "Jewish Chronicle", of April 6, 1906.

The liberalist English historians of the 20th Century have, to a great extent, relied upon such and allied sources of information, for the exposition of the history of England in the 18th Century.

\*

The English nation was still at that time stronger than the Jews and the government dependent upon them. It emerged from the battle against the Naturalisation Law as victor. In powerless fury Jewry had to retreat before the sovereign English people; feeling very small, the corrupt Jew-controlled government was forced to carry out the wishes of their subjects. Without being able to defend themselves, the debt-laden English government had to endure the charges of bribery made against them by their subjects. They had to suffer the charge, that by the Naturalisation Law they wished to incorporate Jewry the with English nation. The English people had once more saved the situation. Its leaders in Parliament knew the dangers which threatened the English by way of the Jew. They instructed the public regarding these dangers with great logic and forceful conviction. It is specially interesting to note that the Earl of Egmont saw quite clearly what a danger international Jewish finance-capital meant to the English nation. He knew the curse that accompanied Jewish gold. He knew that this Jewish gold, which would in the future swamp his country, would be used against England, and would become a curse to his people.

The English nation had triumphed once more over the Jews and the corrupt, Jew-controlled plutocracy. But it was to be its last victory. In spite of all, the Jewish fight for the conquest of England continued unchecked.

## VIII.

To the casual observer it would seem that the Jews had suffered a defeat as the result of the repeal of the Naturalisation Law of 1753. In reality, the influence upon the government of the Jewish clique surrounding Sampson Gideon had become so great that the Jews in spite of all, could from this time on settle down in England in ever increasing comfort, and their influence grew stronger from year to year. The cause of their further advance was the Naturalisation Law of 1740, which, although it had been passed without the knowledge of the English people, still remained in force. The Jews could therefore still become British citizens by the roundabout way of the American colonies. Then also, the Jews, having seen with what obstinate resistance the English nation had withstood their immigration into England, changed their tactics. Leading Jews at this time withdrew from the synagogues and became converted to Christianity. A typical example of how practical and useful the Jews found these new tactics, is given us by the Jewish leader, Sampson Gideon. On May 21, 1754, he withdrew from the synagogue<sup>55)</sup>. His influence on Sir Robert Walpole enabled him to procure, by act of Parliament, the Castle of Spalding, in the neighbourhood of Coventry. This Jewish leader caused his three children, a son and two daughters, to be baptised. Simpson Gideon, son of Sampson Gideon, was educated at Eton. In 1759 Sampson Gideon obtained a baronetcy for his fifteen year old son<sup>56)</sup>.

<sup>55)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", London 1908, pp. 100/101.

<sup>56)</sup> a) "The Jewish Encyclopaedia", Vol. V, pp. 662/663.

b) "Sur Moses Mendelssohn, Sur la Réforme Politique des Juifs: Et en particulier sur la révolution tentée en leur faveur en 1753 dans la Grande Bretagne" par le comte de Mirabeau. Londres, 1787, p. 108.

No wonder that every door was open to this Crypto-Jew, for not only was the government dependent upon him not only was Walpole his bondservant, but even the English King, George II. needed the money this Jew could advance.

The Jewish historian Hertz<sup>57)</sup> writes the following concerning Gideon:

"Sampson Gideon ceased to attend a synagogue, and brought up his children as Anglicans. An ardent patriot, he offered bounties to recruits when the Seven Years' War broke out in 1756, lent £ 40,000 to George II. in his quality of Elector of Hanover."

During the Seven Years' War in 1757 and especially in the years 1758 and 1759 the English Government in its Loans Policy relied fully upon Sampson Gideon<sup>58)</sup>.

That the baptism of all these Jews was merely hypocrisy, merely an attempt to fool the English nation, is plainly seen from the manner in which the present-day Jewish historians write about the baptism of Sampson Gideon. We read in Hertz:

"Sampson Gideon ceased to attend a synagogue, and brought up his children as Anglicans. It is to be observed that he still subscribed secretly to Hebrew organisations, and in his will desired to be laid to his rest in the Portuguese Jews' burying-ground at Mile End, and to be prayed for as a Jew and a married man. Not inappropriately his tomb was adorned by a basso relievo representing the story of Joseph and his brethren<sup>59)</sup>."

How the Jews abused Christianity, for the purpose of obtaining entrance into England and other countries, is seen from the following, and to us, valuable quotation. The Jewish historian, Lucien Wolf, writes in his famous book "Manasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell"<sup>60)</sup> regarding the English Crypto-Jews:

"They left behind them in Spain and Portugal a less scrupulous contingent of their race — wealthy Jews who were disinclined to make sacrifices for the faith of their fathers, and who accepted the conditions of the Inquisition rather than abandon their rich plantations in Andalusia and their palaces in Saragossa, Toledo, and Seville. They embraced Christianity, but their conversion was only simulated, and for two centuries they preserved in secret their allegiance to Judaism. These Crypto-Jews, in their turn gradually spread all over Europe, penetrating in their disguise into countries and towns and even guilds which the Church had jealously guarded against all heretical intrusion. It was chiefly through them that the modern Anglo-Jewish community was founded."

How close the friendship between Sampson Gideon and the nobility was, is seen from the fact that when Sampson Gideon died in 1762 he left his whole fortune of 580,000 pounds<sup>61)</sup> to his son and his daughters and the Duke of Devonshire.

A typical example of how arrogant, boastful and offensive the Jews of the 18th Century were, how they at heart despised the English nobility, we find in "The History of the Jews in Great Britain" by Margoliouth, who writes concerning the above mentioned inheritance of the Duke of Devonshire, that the Duke of Devonshire inherited this Jewish wealth from Gideon

without (Gideon) insisting on the Duke taking his name or being circumcised<sup>62)</sup>."

The son of Sampson Gideon became a member of the exclusive White's Club<sup>63)</sup> and became member of Parliament for Coventry. Count Mirabeau writes:

"In 1766 Simpson Gideon married the daughter of Chief Justice Sir John Eardley Wilmot. He was elected Member of Parliament for Coventry, County Cambridge, in which his castle of Spalding was situated<sup>64)</sup>."

In 1789 he took his wife's name and became Lord Eardley. His Irish title relapsed after his death in 1824, as both his sons, Simpson Eardley and colonel Eardley, died at an earlier date. The daughters of Sampson Gideon married Lord Saye and Sele, Sir Culling Smith and I. W. Childers. Simpson Gideon (Lord Eardley) was a friend of the Elder Pitt and was known in public as Pitt's Jew. When he was raised to the Irish peerage and had taken the name of Lord Eardley of Spalding, it was publicly declared that the English peerage had been insulted<sup>65)</sup>.

That the Jewish advance was in no way checked by the repeal of the Naturalisation Law, the Jewish historians quite frankly admit. They even admit it would not have been possible to develop the British Empire without liberal legislation having been taken on behalf of the Jews. Let us hear what the Jewish historian Hertz has to say on the subject:

"Thwarted though it was by faction, the insignificant Jew act of 1753 heralded not only the slowly accomplished victory of religious toleration, but the discovery that successful territorial expansion cannot be achieved without some relaxation of the principle of race. A great empire is compatible indeed with the assertion of the spirit of nationality, but not with insistence on the letter. The most notable advocates of generosity in 1753 were also pioneers of Greater Britain, and they anticipated in this respect the political genius which secured for Britain Canadian loyalty during the American Revolution and the war of 1812. Indeed this seems to have been the first occasion when the pioneers of Greater Britain expressed the emphatic opinion that the wings of expansion should never be pinioned by any narrow enforcement of racial or ecclesiastical uniformity. Their combination of the practice of liberty with the sense of empire has been one of the eighteenth century's most fruitful legacies to English statesmanship<sup>66)</sup>."

Even when the Jews could not accomplish their entrance into the English nation because the people would not tolerate it, they managed so much more effectively to accomplish their aims by furtive roundabout ways. We have seen that they made use of baptism for this purpose. The detailed account of the rise of Sampson Gideon, his wealth, his friendship with English Minis-

<sup>52)</sup> Margoliouth: "The History of the Jews in Great Britain", London 1851, Vol. II, p. 113.

<sup>53)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", pp. 100/101.

<sup>54)</sup> "Sur Moses Mendelssohn, Sur la Réforme Politique des Juifs: Et en particulier sur la révolution tentée en leur faveur en 1753 dans la Grande Bretagne" par le Comte de Mirabeau, Londres, 1787, p. 108.

<sup>55)</sup> Francis: "Chronicles of the Stock Exchange", pp. 88—90, Nichols: "Literary Anecdotes", IX, 642; idem, "Illustrations", VI, 277—284; "Jewish World", February 1878;

Picciotto: "Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History", pp. 60—64, 84, 113, London 1875.

"Young Israel", June 1899 "Rict National Biography".

Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", pp. 100/101.

<sup>56)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", London 1908, pp. 106/108.

<sup>57)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", London, pp. 100/101.

<sup>58)</sup> "Jewish Encyclopaedia", Vol. V, pp. 662/665.

<sup>59)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", London, pp. 100/101.

<sup>60)</sup> Lucien Wolf: "Manasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell", p. 12.

<sup>61)</sup> Hertz: "British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century", p. 95.

ters and English politicians, the account of the rise of his son, who became a member of Parliament and an Irish peer, is here only mentioned as a typical example. A succession of Sephardic Jewish families made similar successful attempts to marry into the English landed gentry. They attained similar great influence. The English nation in the middle of the 18th Century once more withstood the invasion of the Jews, but the nobility was thoroughly beaten. "World-Service"<sup>67)</sup> described, how it was found necessary in England in 1772 to safeguard the English Royal Family against the entrance of Jewish blood, that the Jewish mistresses of the Walpole clique especially came to possess unheard-of influence, that the "Royal Marriage Bill" in England in 1772 constituted a barrier against similar impudent advances on the part of the Jews as regards the Royal Family. We learned that the Duke of Gloucester, the brother of George III., had married a granddaughter of the Jew Isaak Norsa from Mantua.

In the same manner as the Jew Sampson Gideon had risen to power, his son, who received the title of Baron Eardley of Spalding, also rose. Gladstone's Chancellor of the Exchequer, H. C. F. Childers, was a descendant of Sampson Gideon. Another Jewish ancestor of well-known aristocratic families was Pelegrin Treves, who also belongs to the English Jewish clique of the middle of the 18th Century. The descendants of Treves became Christians. Lord Donington, Lord Loundon and the Duchess of Norfolk were descendants of Treves. Lord Houghton and the Marquis of Crewe are descendants of the rich sephardic Jew Joseph da Costa of Totteridge. Another sephardic Jew of the middle of the 18th Century, Moses Mendez, counted among his descendants the Earl of Carnarvon. A further Jew, John Braham, a singer of the Hanovarian Court, was the ancestor of Lord Carlingford. The descendants of the sephardic Jew Jakob Israel Bernal, married into the families of the Duke of St. Albans, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Cavendish, Lord Palmiel and Lord Cranbourne. At the same time that the English sephardic Jews were penetrating into the English aristocratic families, the forefathers of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, were becoming prominent. The Duke of Richmond, the Duke of Northumberland and the Earl of Meath were connected with the Ricardo family; Lord Churston, Lord Ludlow and Lord Bledislow were related to the sephardic Jewish family Lopez. The descendants of the sephardic Jewish family of Dr. Samuel Salomon boasts of wide-spread aristocratic connections. Although we could lengthen this list considerably, we content ourselves with the enumeration of the above names.

To what extent the English aristocracy is judaised, the striking confession of one of its representatives shows us. The Earl of Crewe, President of the Privy Council, a descendant of the sephardic Jewess, Kitty da Costa, on Feb. 5, 1906, on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the Whitehall Conference, in a speech said<sup>68)</sup>:

"Somewhere about two hundred years ago, I think, my great-great-grandfather married a Portuguese lady of the Jewish race. But the most interesting fact in connection with the alliance is that it enables me to claim, possibly a somewhat remote, but quite authentic,

kinship with the most distinguished Englishman of the Jewish race who has lived since the Whitehall Conference — I mean Lord Beaconsfield. I do not know whether the illustrious shade of that statesman ever in these times visits the precincts of Downing Street and Whitehall. If so, he may see some things of which he would not entirely approve, but I hope that he will, for the sake of the reason I have named, cast an indulgent glance over the room occupied by the President of the Privy Council. That fact leads me to make a suggestion. Many of you are, no doubt, aware that books are published indicating the descent of various people in this country from the royal family. Honest citizens study these volumes, and find they are descended from a Plantagenet or even from a Tudor monarch, and their satisfaction at the discovery is only tempered by the fact that hundreds of thousands can boast the same distinction. But my suggestion is this: Some person of leisure with a taste for genealogy should attempt to trace the Jewish descent of what I may call the titled and untitled nobility in this country. Without going quite so far as Mr. Lowell — for it must be admitted that there are men of tolerable intellect and good character with no Jewish blood in their veins — yet that inquiry would come as a revelation to some people of the extent to which English families have been allied with those of the Jewish race."

Here a prominent representative of the English aristocracy, who also is a Cabinet Minister, quite frankly admits the complete assimilation of English Jewry with the English nobility.

Could there possibly be a better proof of the judaising of the English ruling classes?

\*

We see therefore, that Jewry understood how to convert the victory of the English people into a defeat for the English people and into a gain for themselves. Jewry accomplished this absolute triumph over the English nation by a change of tactics. Whereas the Jews previously had attempted to obtain the upper hand in England, to a certain extent by constitutional means, by seeking to influence Parliament to pass Immigration and Naturalisation Laws in favour of their friends, they now employed a completely different, but even more successful method of accomplishing their ends. They simply had themselves baptised, became Christians, and by this change of front there was a greater possibility of putting into practice their plans for the domination of England. That this move did not represent an honest conversion to Christianity, but that the Jews in this instance were acting as opportunists, to be able to make use of the advantages it would bring, the Jewish historians Hertz and Lucien Wolf clearly reveal. That this conversion to Christianity was mere hypocrisy is shown by the fact that Sampson Gideon, like all other baptised Jews who had before and after their baptism supported Jewish organisations, was buried in the Jewish cemetery. It is remarkable that the grave of this "Christian" was decorated with a representation of the history of Joseph in Egypt, who, it is well known, was the best friend and adviser of the Egyptian King, and who by his speculations in grain exploited the Egyptian people. Could there be a better symbol, could there be a better parallel than the one between Joseph of Egypt and Sampson Gideon, the friend of Walpole and the financier of the English King? Verily, the Jews in England knew to what extent they were indebted to their leader Sampson Gideon.

<sup>67)</sup> "World-Service" VII/5/6, art. 14.

"B'nai B'rith National Jewish Monthly", June 1954.

<sup>68)</sup> "Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England" 1908, Vol. V, p. 295.

It is also interesting that the Jewish historian Lucien Wolf frankly admits, that these baptised Jews, these Crypto-Jews, were the founders of the modern Anglo-Jewish community.

By becoming Christians the Jews accomplished to the fullest extent everything they formerly could only partially carry out. The baptism of the new-Christians became the starting point for the complete conquest of England by Jewry. Sampson Gideon, and his Jewish clique, under the cloak of Christianity, in close cooperation with the English government, now carried on their profiteering racket to their heart's content. With Sir Robert Walpole's help Sampson Gideon succeeded in inducing Parliament to grant him a special dispensation, by which he was conceded the right to own real and land estates.

Sampson Gideon's son Simpson received the full privileges of the landed gentry and therefore of the ruling classes of England. He was educated at Eton and received a baronetcy at the age of fifteen. He later became member of Parliament for Coventry. The select White's Club in London accepted him as a member. In 1766 Simpson married the daughter of the Chief Justice, Sir John Eardley Wilmot. In 1789 he took his wife's name and was granted the title Lord Eardley of Spalding and was raised to the Irish peerage.

In like manner as his father was the intimate friend of Sir Robert Walpole, so also Simpson Gideon was the friend and adviser of the Jewish bondsman, the Elder Pitt.

How closely Sampson Gideon was connected with the English aristocracy is proved by the fact that the Earl of Devonshire was mentioned in his will together with his son and two daughters. But at heart Jewry despised the English nobility. The word of the Jewish historian, Margoliouth, that the Earl of Devonshire inherited part of Gideon's fortune, without being required to take the Jew's name, or being circumcised, is sufficient proof of this fact.

But there was something else that characterised this period of the Jewish penetration of England. We have seen how the Jew Sampson Gideon, having secured influence over the English Government by bribery and corruption, could now go a step farther. In 1756 Gideon placed King George II. in his capacity as Grand Duke of Hanover under obligation by advancing him money. By this act English Jewry had penetrated through to the very Crown. A further decisive step towards the conquest of England was thereby completed: for once, having gained a place in the sunshine of the British Empire, the Jews could not encounter many further difficulties.

Once Jews had been received at Court and had been granted citizenship, the English nobility no longer felt degraded by intermarriage with Jews. Uninterrupted, the penetration and disintegration of the English nobility by Jewry now continued. Uninterrupted, the Jewish invasion of the ruling classes, whose national opposition was broken down, was now continued on a broad basis. After Jewry had in this way succeeded in worming its way into the nobility, it could from this strong position carry on its campaign against the English nation. It now began the third stage of its conquest of England. In a period of about 100 years it had accomplished this. In the reign of Queen Victoria the last resistance of the English nation was broken down. Judah had conquered England. Jewish-English Plutocracy was stabilized by the Jews and by

section of the ruling classes which was connected with it by ties of blood, and which was to be still further extended in the 20th Century. Jewish interests and the interests of the Jewish-English aristocracy were now identical. Through this plutocratic system of government Jewish and British Imperialism were firmly welded together. The strong bands by which the Jews had bound the English nobility to themselves were those of blood relationship and finance-capital. Jewish gold now became the undeniable ruler of England. Jewish unscrupulousness and aggressiveness, shady Jewish business methods and speculations, Jewish avarice and greed from now on became the characteristics and the stamp of the ruling classes, now to be counted in with the Jews.

These were the corner-stones that were used in building up the British Empire in its present form. These are the foundations upon which it rests.

The Jewish historian Hertz, in writing on this subject, says of the supporters of the Naturalisation Laws, that they were the "Pioneers of Greater Britain". By this he implies that without the Jews there would have been no British Empire, or that without the Jews the British Empire would not have been capable of existing or developing.

## IX.

The foregoing treatise, which forms only a fragment of the English History of the 18th Century, shows quite definitely, that England even at that time was a Jew-controlled state, and that Jewry even then understood how to bring a Jew-controlled government to heel. We see how a small number of Jews among the ruling classes, in conjunction with ministers, bribed by and dependent upon the Jews, were able to use their power to enrich themselves unscrupulously. The Jews of that time succeeded in being raised to the peerage.

But still they could not accomplish the absolute domination of England. The English nation at that time still possessed a naturally healthy instinct. Roused to the utmost indignation the people set themselves energetically to resist the Jewish penetration. Against the wishes of the nation, the Jews, aided and abetted by corrupt English ministers, circumvented the Immigration and Naturalisation Laws. In bitter strife against the English nation the foundation of the plutocratic system of government was laid, which was to be carried out in the 19th Century by the goldsmiths, and the families of Rothschild, Ricardo and others. In 1858 Jewish emancipation in England became an accomplished fact. The Jews were granted full citizenship. They could be elected to the House of Commons. In 1868 the Jew Disraeli, who had been raised to the peerage as Lord Beaconsfield, received the highest honour England has to offer: he became the British Prime Minister and as such administered the fate of England according to Jewish imperialistic ideas. The conquest of England by Jewry and the plutocratic system of government in England that was bound up with it, became an accomplished fact. British Imperialism and Jewish Imperialism had become one. Inseparable were the bonds, which from now on bound the English nobility by ties of blood to English Jewry; Jewish capitalism was inseparably bound up with British capital. From then onwards the interests of both were identical. They were the identical interests that bound English Jewry to the judaised English ruling classes in a common destiny. The voice of the English people, the call of the blood, had been stilled. Jewry

had conquered England and turned it into a plutocratic state. The Jewish-English dance around the Golden Calf had commenced. Unheard-of wealth was piled up. Anxiously its small circle of Jewish-English possessors saw to it that no "uninitiated" (not belonging to the clique) could reap any benefit from it. The favoured few, the Jewish-English ruling class, hermetically sealed the doors against the English nation. For the nation the time of ever-increasing poverty had dawned. Jewish rule means the death of a nation. Betrayed by its rulers, governed and exploited by Jews, the English nation, entered the 20th Century, treading the path of suffering. The Jews, continued to climb the ladder to power and might. In 1904 the Jew Rufus Isaacs became a member of the House of Commons. In 1910 he was knighted as Sir Rufus Isaacs and became Attorney-General and King's Counsel. In 1912 he became Minister for Justice in Asquith's Cabinet. In 1915 he became Lord Chief Justice, a position he occupied uninterruptedly until 1921. In 1914 he was raised to the peerage as Lord Reading. In 1915 he became Viscount Reading. In 1917 he went to the United States as a special ambassador. In the same year he received an Earldom. In 1918 he went to the United States as Minister Plenipotentiary. In 1921 he became Viceroy of India, in 1926 Marquis of Reading and received the Freedom of the City of London. In 1931 he became Minister for Foreign Affairs and in 1934 Warden of the Cinque Ports. It was one of the highest honours the British Empire had to offer. The Warden of the Cinque Ports, warden and governor of the five harbours, is one of the nobles from whom the King receives the crown. To the Warden of the Cinque Ports, during the Coronation ceremony, the King gives his oath.

The Jew Rufus Isaacs was, therefore, favoured with three of the highest honours that it is possible for an Englishman to hold. As Marquis he held the highest English title which any Englishman not of royal birth can hold. As Warden of Cinque Ports he received one of the highest posts of honour which England has to offer and as Viceroy of India he had the honour of representing the King himself.

This fact, that in a Jew this trinity of three of the greatest honours were combined, proves more than anything else how great the power of Jewry in England had become. It is the best proof that Jewish gold had conquered England.

A certain measure of tragedy is not wanting in the fact that Rufus Isaacs especially received the title of Lord Reading, that he bore the name of the town, which in 1735 protested most strongly against the Jews receiving citizenship<sup>60)</sup>.

In this connection one remembers, that it was a Jew who wished to place the German Imperial crown on the head of a Prussian King. As speaker of the German Unity Movement in 1849 the Jew Edward Simson, President of the Frankfurt National Movement, offered the Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm IV. the German Imperial crown. The acceptance of the German Imperial crown from the hands of a Jew would doubtless have been of the greatest symbolic value to Jewry. The refusal on the part of the Prussian King prevented Germany from becoming an Empire through the grace of Judah.

In the 20th Century, the age of Technique and Industrialisation, Jewry carried out the plutocratic system of government in England to its greatest perfection. Business and profit from now on ruled unchecked

within the boundaries of the British Empire. The conception of the English shopkeeper- and dealer-mentality, which is of Jewish origin, was born in contrast to the conception of fair-dealing in other countries.

Such expressions as: "The Englishman says Christianity, but means cotton" show, that the world at large recognised the hypocrisy and mendacity of the English-Jewish shopkeepers and dealers. Sheer avarice and profit became the general guiding principle of the government which depended upon the Jewish-English plutocratic clique. The profits meant all, the nation nothing. The English nation was exploited by its Jewish-English finance hyenas exactly as the natives of the English colonies and dominions had been. In those places where work could be done by poorly-paid native labour, it was done, thereby throwing English workers on the streets. Dire necessity and poverty of the English workers were the result of this Jewish-English plutocracy. The English nation in the 20th Century began to be painfully aware of the curse of Jewish gold.

The well-known Jew-friendly English author, Hilaire Belloc writes regarding the conquest of England by the Jews:<sup>70)</sup>

"And the Jew pointed to the English State as that one in which all that his nation required of the goyim was to be found. He here enjoyed a situation the like of which he could not hope to enjoy in any other country of the world. All antagonism to him had died down. He was admitted to every institution in the State, a prominent member of his nation became chief officer of the English Executive . . .<sup>71)</sup>

Specially Jewish institutions, such as Freemasonry (which the Jews had inaugurated as a sort of bridge between themselves and their hosts in the seventeenth century), were particularly strong in Britain, and there arose a political tradition, active, and ultimately to prove of great importance, whereby the British State was tacitly accepted by foreign governments as the official protector of the Jews in other countries . . ."

Here an acknowledged English author and friend of the Jews unreservedly admits, that England is the country, which according to an old tradition, comes forward before the whole world as champion of the Jews. How could it be different in a plutocratic state? In the plutocratic system of government in England we find the real reason for England having to-day declared war against national-socialist, anti-Jewish Germany.

The English government did not declare war against Germany in the interests of the English people, nor to eventually protect British subjects from possible German acts of aggression, but she declared war solely in the interests of the Jews who control England and in the interests of Jewish-English finance-capital which was looking for the first opportunity to break loose, both of which are the acknowledged enemies of every form of national Socialism.

England cannot wage any war in the interests of the English nation, for the English government cannot be considered the representative of its own people, nor does it possess the confidence of the nation. On the contrary, it merely fulfils the task of protecting the immense wealth which is in the hands of the small circle: the Jewish-English ruling class; it further guarantees that this small Jewish-English clique shall increase its enormous capital unhindered.

<sup>70)</sup> Hilaire Belloc: "The Jews", 1922, p. 225.

<sup>71)</sup> Reference concerns the Jewish Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lord Beaconsfield, alias Disraeli.

<sup>60)</sup> "Gentleman's Magazine", 1755, p. 469.

To-day the Jews, as well as the English press, wish to make us believe, that the Jewish-English alliance only came into being during the present war, and that it finds its natural cause in the Jewish persecution in Germany and that, the anti-Jewish laws of the Third Reich, forcibly drove the Jews to side with England in this war.

This, as we have seen, is not true.

The Jewish-English alliance originated solely and simply through the inseparable bond between Jewish Imperialism and British Imperialism, and in the fact that Jewish finance-capital is identical with British finance-capital.

It has its origin solely and simply in the blood-ties between the Jews and the English nobility and the fact that the Jews succeeded in turning England into a plutocratic state.

The Jews did not come into the war as allies of England because Germany had persecuted them, but England declared war against Germany because the English government is the blind obedient servant of

Jewish commands, exactly as England is the sworn enemy of all anti-Jewish states and, according to its plutocratic structure, of necessity must be.

The English government declared war against Germany because it is a Jew-controlled government and as such represents the Sword of Judah against anti-Judaism and against any form of national Socialism.

The English government declared war against Germany because Englishmen are not the rulers of England, but because Jewish finance-capital rules and because England is a plutocratic state.

Colonel H. L. Nathan, M. P., honorary President of the South-West London Zionist Society, closed a speech with these words:

**"When Zion falls, the British Empire falls too"**<sup>72</sup>).

These significant words prove that the destinies of Jewry and the British Empire are bound up in each other, inseparably bound, by what has become a Jewish-British Plutocracy.

<sup>72</sup>) "The Jewish Chronicle", January, 27, 1939, p. 29.

**ORDER FROM  
SONS OF LIBERTY**

**P. O. BOX 214, METAIRIE, LA. 70004**